



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

program was a brilliant lecture by Dr. Walton McDaniel on Pliny and Lake Como. Dr. McDaniel, always witty and delightful, was at his best as he led his audience around Lake Como in a fascinating search for Pliny's villas.

It is with pleasure that we report that one hundred and eighty-eight persons paid dues and joined the Association on the day of the meeting, and that several requests for membership have since been received so that the Society, while yet in its first swaddling-bands, is equipped with twice the strength of a Briareus-omen firmetur. The following officers were elected: President, Dr. Walter Dennison, Swarthmore College; Vice-Presidents, Dr. B. W. Mitchell, Central High School, Mr. Stanley Yarnall, Principal of Friends' School, Germantown; Secretary, Miss Jessie E. Allen, Philadelphia High School for Girls; Treasurer, Dr. George Hadzsits, University of Pennsylvania. Other members of the Executive Committee were Dr. W. H. Appleton, Professor Emeritus, Swarthmore College, Professor W. Baker, Haverford College, Miss Minnie Beckwith, Baldwin School, Dr. F. B. Brandt, School of Pedagogy, Dr. Bessie Burchett, Girls' High School, Professor F. A. Dakin, Haverford School, Dr. Edith Hall, University of Pennsylvania Museum, Professor James Hill, Central High School, Professor Frank Niewig, Southern High School, Miss Mary Swindler, Bryn Mawr College.

JESSIE E. ALLEN, *Secretary*.

REVIEWS

Geschichte der Römischen Literatur. Von Friedrich Leo. Erster Band. Die Archaische Literatur. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung (1913). Pp. IV + 496.15 Marks, bound¹.

The appearance of a book on Latin literature—or, as he prefers to call it, 'Roman' literature—by Friedrich Leo, the distinguished Professor of Classical Philology at Göttingen, is distinctly an event. For thirty-five years or more Professor Leo has been one of the most capable, diligent, and productive workers in the field of ancient classical literature—more particularly in the Latin branch, but always with the close connection of the Latin and the Greek clearly in view. The list of his previous writings is too long to be cited here, but it shows that he has ranged over the field from beginning to end (from the pre-literary beginnings of comedy to the sixth century Christian poet, Venantius Fortunatus); from border to border (e.g. from *Quaestiones Aristophaneae*, 1873, to *Die Originalität der Römischen Literatur*, 1904); from editions of authors (Plautus, Seneca, and others) to minute investigations of particular literary species (e.g. *Die*

Griechisch-Römische Biographie, 1901; *Der Monolog im Drama*, 1908) and chapters on the history of ancient metric (e.g. *Die Plautinische Cantica und die Hellenistische Lyrik*, 1897; *Der Saturnische Vers*, 1905).

A thing that the mere listing of works cannot show, but which is eminently true of Leo's work from beginning to end, is that it is characterized by an obvious impulse to get to the very bottom of things; neglecting no possible source of information, yet subjecting everything to sharp scrutiny and independent judgment; accepting nothing on mere authority; combining scattered, scanty, and often conflicting evidence with rare skill. It is noticeable in this latest volume that, in tracing the development of the early literature, he lays great stress on strong individual personalities, who did not merely drift with the currents of the time, but laid hold of something with individuality and blazed new paths. He is such a personality himself—a true scholar, an investigator, a man with ideas and the ability to develop them into something new and substantial.

The volume under review covers the period from the beginnings to about 90 B.C. and contains, besides a table of contents and two indices, 443 pages of 'history' and 44 pages of illustrative selections from Latin literature in German translations. The historical part falls into nine chapters: I Conditions and Elements of Literary Development in Italy; II Law and Speech; III The Beginnings; IV Naevius; V Plautus; VI Ennius; VII The Successors of Plautus and Ennius; VIII Literature and Roman Culture; IX The Poetry of the Closing Second Century. Each chapter is divided into from three to six numbered sections. Thus, in Chapter I there are three subdivisions: (1) Romans, Greeks, Italians; (2) Greek and Etruscan Culture-Influences; (3) Pre-Literary Remains and Traces. The Saturnian Verse. In Chapter V (Plautus) we have (1) Life; (2) The Attic Comedy; (3) Lyrically Amplified Comedies of Plautus; (4) Amalgamation with the Hellenistic Musical Farce (*Singspiel*); (5) 'Contaminated' Comedies; (6) Style and Art. This list of chapter-headings, with titles of the subordinate divisions in two representative chapters, will serve to show in a general way how the ground is covered. It remains to specify briefly some of the distinctive features of the book.

That the author is master of all the available material, including even the latest papyrus finds, and has prepared himself for the present task by a lifetime of work in the field, producing a multitude of *Vorarbeiten* that are at his command as a partial foundation for the new work, has already been sufficiently indicated. His control of the material naturally includes familiarity with all the secondary literature on the subject, as is abundantly shown on occasion. His work is, however, in no sense or

¹This article is condensed from a review presented to the Yale Classical Club in November, 1913. Since this article was prepared classical scholarship has suffered a grievous loss in the death of Professor Leo.

degree a summary or compilation of the work of others, with systematic documentation; it is, rather, distinctly and conspicuously a first-hand study of the ancient literature itself, both the Latin and the Greek, with citation of the contributory or conflicting views of other scholars only when, for one reason or another, they are of especial importance.

The writer is not merely learned; he is mentally keen and alert, prolific in fresh ideas, constantly finding new points of view, and abounding in stimulating suggestions. His suggestion of an analogy between the relation of Augustan poetry to Cicero's oratory and that of the earliest literary poetry to the early oratory (p. 33), for example, is illuminating; so, too, his comparison of the work of the early Roman jurists in evolving the fundamental rules of civil intercourse, the conceptions of property rights, etc., with that of the early Greek philosophers in bringing to light the problems of the world and proposing various solutions of them which have continued to be the starting-points for scientific thinking the world over (22).

The style and tone of the book are excellent. The stress throughout is on the thing, rather than on the word. The author is serenely master of his subject and well exemplifies old Cato's rule: *rem tene, verba sequentur*. There is little or no 'fine writing', almost never any obscurity of expression; philosophical abstractions, generalizations unsupported by basic details, and flightiness of any sort are conspicuously lacking. There is no offensive belligerency, but views of other scholars that seem to the author erroneous are calmly passed by or dismissed by him as by one entitled to judge, sometimes with specific reasons given, sometimes not.

Above all, however, the thing that calls for emphasis among the various points of excellence in this book is its general structure. It is not a collection of monographs or loosely connected chapters, but a coherently woven, connected expository narrative. Numerous sections dealing with various general movements, developments, or sets of circumstances or influences are a notable feature of the work. The section on Greek and Etruscan contributions to Roman culture in the pre-literary period (I 2), for example, brings together in a remarkably clear and impressive way the scattered items from all sources (the alphabet, early borrowings of words, Greek elements in Roman law, the earliest public architecture at Rome, Etruscan names in Latin, Rome's acquisition of a dominant position in Latium in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., intercourse with Cumae, early modifications of the state religion, the upgrowth of a subordinate Greek population at Rome, etc.), and presents within moderate compass a vivid and convincing picture of the whole hinterland of foreign culture-influence at Rome in the early times that

cannot be paralleled elsewhere. In such sections as this Leo's rare skill in combining scattered or scanty details into a substantial whole is particularly noticeable, though this is by no means confined to such more or less general sections, but is everywhere apparent. The sketch of the earliest development of Roman law (II 1), as a preliminary to the section on pre-literary speech (II 2), is masterly; and in the latter section (II 2) the large part played by speaking (in the senate, in the assembly, and in the courts) in the development of the language as a vehicle for artistic expression for at least two centuries before the beginning of the Romano-Greek literature (as the author calls the new literature developed by Livius Andronicus and his successors) is most clearly set forth. The sketch of the later development of the Greek literature and the relation of the Roman literature to the Greek (III 1), presented without any documentation at all, except a single reference to Athenaeus on a specific point, is above praise. One will look in vain elsewhere for any single account, long or short, that presents so clearly this interesting and important subject. First comes a brilliant sketch of the Alexandrian literature (the separation of the particular sciences from philosophy after Aristotle; the development of Alexandria, with its great library, as the new scientific center; the characteristics of the Alexandrian writers and writings; etc.), followed by the observation that this Alexandrian literature, though it subsequently became 'classical' and, as such, exercised much influence on Latin literature at a later time, did not in any way affect or touch the Greek freedman who started the Romano-Greek literature. Then the fact that in the other, older parts of the Greek world (naturally including south Italy) the *Attic* literature everywhere spread and developed is set forth, with details as to the various lines of development, including various lower types of literature, such as the many sorts of popular farces, which were soon to come into account for the Latin literature, though not at the very beginning, in which only the classical Greek poetry played a part. Then follows an interesting contrast of the Hellenistic culture with the Roman character of the time; then a sketch of the influence of Greek slaves and freedmen at Rome from early times, paving the way for the reception of Greek influence on a larger scale after the conquest of South Italy; and finally the stage is set for the coming drama: on the one side the politically dominant Romans, now masters of the whole peninsula and with the spread of the Latin language over the whole of it well under way, on the other side the politically subordinate Greeks, with their culture, art, and language. This is all fine constructive work. The narrative has an almost epic sweep, and could scarcely be surpassed. Among the other topics

treated in sections of similar character to that of those just noticed are the development of Attic comedy (V 2); literary conditions at Rome in the generation after Plautus (VII 1); the permeation of Roman society by Greek culture-influences as bearing upon the beginning of prose literature at Rome, which, unlike the poetical beginnings, sprang not from freedmen or outsiders, but from men of old Roman tradition, who had held high public offices, led Roman armies, and governed peoples (VIII 1); the development of philological study and writing among the Greeks and subsequently, under strong Greek influence, among the Romans (VIII 6); and the development of Latin comedy as a whole (IX 1). Such sections as these serve as a background into which the more particular topics (individual authors, etc.) are nicely fitted; the individual elements in the design are distinctly drawn, but they are likewise effectively combined into a coherent general pattern. If it be the task of classical philology to reconstruct, interpret, and bring vividly before us a connected, organic whole, Leo has certainly contributed largely to the performance of this task in his new book, and particularly so in the sections just noticed and others of similar character. He has thrown light into dark corners, put flesh upon dry bones, and combined details into a clear, vivid, connected account of the general movement and development.

A special word must be said about the treatment of the relations of the Latin literature to the Greek. No other writer has made this important subject so plain in all its details, so far as Professor Leo has gone. He does this partly in occasional sections of a more or less general character, some of which have already been noticed (e.g. I 2, III 1, VIII 6), but also in connection with particular authors. The notable thing in all this is that broad general statements unsupported by detailed basic facts are everywhere avoided, and that there is explicit demonstration of (1) what the Greek contributions were and (2) how the Romans, while freely adopting and adapting from the Greek, yet put their own national stamp on all that they took over or developed. To take a single example, Lucilius is distinctly put—as to subject-matter and tone—in the line of descent from the Greek writers who expressed their personal feelings and thoughts in verse or prose (Hesiod, Archilochus, Hipponax, and other earlier writers, and numerous writers of the Hellenistic period, such as Callimachus, Phoenix, Machon, and Menippus), yet is shown to have developed a literary form (*Gattung*) that is new and quite his own (IX 3).

One can scarcely close a review of Leo's volume without a word about its relation to rivals in the field, especially Teuffel's and Schanz's books under

the same title, both of which are now appearing in new editions. Leo does not come quite squarely into competition with either of these works. Schanz's book, with its admirably clear, full, and 'orderly' presentation of the subject, taking into account and systematically indexing all the important work of modern scholars in the field, will doubtless continue to be the best *hand-book*—the book to which the student who wishes to orient himself on any particular author or topic, or to get hand-book or bibliographical information in general, will first turn. The new Teuffel (as stated by Kroll in the preface to the second volume) frankly abandons the attempt to combine literary history and full bibliography, by largely cutting down the latter. It will continue to be useful, though distinctly less so than Schanz, for general hand-book purposes, but more particularly, perhaps, for its convenient eidographic section at the beginning and as a corrective or supplement to Schanz. Leo's book, like the new Teuffel, lacks full bibliographical data, and its arrangement is perhaps not quite so systematic and convenient for hand-book purposes as that of either Teuffel or Schanz. It is, rather, primarily a book to be read as a whole than one to be consulted as an encyclopedia or a hand-book. It certainly has its place in one's case of reference-books, but it belongs primarily on the reading-table.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

J. W. D. INGERSOLL.

Cretan Elements in the Cults and Ritual of Apollo.

By Mary Hamilton Swindler. Bryn Mawr College Monographs, Monograph Series, Vol. XIII (1913).

Examining briefly the Cretan boast that their island was the home of religion and of the gods, and reviewing the various and sundry guesses as to the original home and character of Apollo, the author of this dissertation passes on to consider the various Cretan cults which this god drew into his cult.

PYTHIOS.—Several important points in regard to the cult of the Pythian Apollo at Delphi seem to indicate a connection between Crete and Delphi prior to Apollo's seizure of the oracle. Traces of a Minoan settlement at Pytho indicate early relations; legends concerning the founding of the oracle seem to have Minoan characteristics, particularly the goats and the sacred laurel in the temenos at Delphi; and further the fact that Apollo brought from Crete the priests who interpreted his oracle points in the same direction.

DELPHINIOS.—The author believes that this word is from the root *δελφ-* through *δελφίς*, 'belly-fish', and that the cult was that of a dolphin god. Cretan origin is argued mainly from the localities where Apollo Delphinios was worshipped, these places being for the most part either Cretan or having Cretan